



MINUTES OF THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS  
COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES, STATE OF CALIFORNIA

Violet Varona-Lukens, Executive Officer  
Clerk of the Board of Supervisors  
383 Kenneth Hahn Hall of Administration  
Los Angeles, California 90012

Chief Administrative Officer

At its meeting held May 14, 2002, the Board took the following action:

87

David E. Janssen, the Chief Administrative Officer, made a verbal presentation on the attached joint report with County Counsel regarding a mechanism between the Sheriff's Department and the County on behalf of the unincorporated residents, for the provision of general law enforcement services equal to the baseline level of service provided in different jurisdictions. Marvin Dixon, Chief, Sheriff's Department, responded to questions posed by the Board.

Reverend Charles Brady, Pascual Cervera, Mary Johnson and Araceli Dominguez addressed the Board.

Supervisor Molina made the following statement:

"For the past several years, this Board has been concerned about whether the Sheriff Department's contracts with various cities ('Contract Cities') unfairly drain resources from the County's unincorporated areas. On May 9, 2002, the Auditor-Controller released a report concluding that for the 2000-01 Fiscal Year, the County did not bill the City of Pico Rivera for services worth approximately \$277,000. The same report noted that for Fiscal Year 2001-02, as of March 31, 2002, the County has subsidized this City by approximately \$137,000.

"While such statistics may vary over time and from station to station, they are a clear indication that the Contract Cities can act as a drain on the Department and the County budget. Yet, the Sheriff has made clear that he intends to pursue additional contracts with cities as a means of building his department. I learned yesterday that the Sheriff continues to evaluate whether the Department should contract with the South Gate Police Department.

(Continued on Page 2)

Syn. 87 (Continued)

"A number of Sheriff's personnel are being used to engage in this study that involves, for example, conducting background checks of the current South Gate police force. The study of the South Gate Police Department is being conducted even though the Board has not approved the funding in the Department's budget, and even though the estimated cost to the City of South Gate exceeds \$100,000. A policy is in place that requires all Sheriff contracts that exceed \$100,000 to come before the Board. In addition, Sheriff's personnel are spending a significant amount of time conducting the study, even though the Department is threatening to eliminate over 1,000 positions due to a budgetary shortfall that the Department claims is approximately \$100 million. The Sheriff's Department should not engage in such activities if they drain scarce resources from the County."

After discussion, Supervisor Molina made a motion that the Board take the following actions:

1. Request the Sheriff to immediately stop the study of the feasibility of contracting with the City of South Gate until the Board approves the budgetary appropriation for this task;
2. Instruct the Chief Administrative Officer, with the aid of County Counsel and the Auditor-Controller, to report back to the Board within 30 days with a draft policy or ordinance that requires an analysis to be performed by the Auditor-Controller and the Chief Administrative Officer prior to approval of any future Sheriff contract to provide law enforcement services to incorporated cities with analysis to include:
  - A determination of whether the contract ensures that the County will record, bill and collect all fees for billable services provided to Contract Cities;
  - An analysis of what services provided by the Sheriff's Department or costs incurred by the Department (for example overhead, employee benefits and workers' compensation costs) are being charged or not charged to Contract Cities; and

(Continued on Page 3)

Syn. 87 (Continued)

- An analysis by the Sheriff, to be approved by the Chief Administrative Officer and Auditor-Controller, of whether the contract will negatively impact the Sheriff's services to unincorporated areas; and
3. Instruct the Chief Administrative Officer, with the aid of the Sheriff and the Auditor-Controller, to report back to the Board within two weeks concerning the ability of the County to be reimbursed for the unbilled expenses incurred by the City of Pico Rivera in Fiscal Years 2000-01 and 2001-02.

After further discussion, Supervisor Antonovich requested a division of the question, in relation to Recommendations 1 through 3 of Supervisor Molina's motion.

On motion of Supervisor Molina, seconded by Supervisor Yaroslavsky, duly carried by the following vote: Ayes: Supervisor Molina, Burke, Yaroslavsky; Noes: Supervisors Knabe and Antonovich, the Board requested the Sheriff to immediately stop the study of the feasibility of contracting with the City of South Gate until the Board approves the budgetary appropriation for this task.

On motion of Supervisor Molina, seconded by Supervisor Yaroslavsky, duly carried by the following vote: Ayes: Supervisor Molina, Burke, Yaroslavsky and Antonovich; Noes: Supervisors Knabe, the Board instructed the Chief Administrative Officer, with the aid of County Counsel and the Auditor-Controller, to report back within 30 days with a draft policy or ordinance that requires an analysis to be performed by the Auditor-Controller and the Chief Administrative Officer prior to approval of any future Sheriff contract to provide law enforcement services to incorporated cities with the analysis to include:

- A determination of whether the contract ensures that the County will record, bill and collect all fees for billable services provided to Contract Cities;
- An analysis of what services provided by the Sheriff's Department or costs incurred by the Department (for example overhead, employee benefits and workers' compensation costs) are being charged or not charged to Contract Cities;

(Continued on Page 4)

Syn. 87 (Continued)

- An analysis by the Sheriff, to be approved by the Chief Administrative Officer and Auditor-Controller, of whether the contract will negatively impact the Sheriff's services to unincorporated areas.

On motion of Supervisor Molina, seconded by Supervisor Yaroslavsky, duly carried by the following vote: Ayes: Supervisor Molina, Burke, Yaroslavsky and Antonovich; Noes: Supervisors Knabe, the Board instructed the Chief Administrative Officer, with the aid of the Sheriff and the Auditor-Controller, to report back within two weeks concerning the ability of the County to be reimbursed for the unbilled expenses incurred by the City of Pico Rivera in Fiscal Years 2000-01 and 2001-02.

4051402-87

Attachment

Copies distributed:  
Each Supervisor  
County Counsel  
Auditor-Controller

Letter sent to:  
Sheriff